

Applicant affirms the election of species A with traverse because species B (Figure 7) differs from species A because of an additional aerodynamically shaped standoff vane 702 added between aerodynamic standoff vanes 302; and species C (Figure 11) differs from species A because aerodynamically shaped standoff vane 940 is a separate removable piece.

IN THE DRAWINGS

It is asserted in the Office Action that the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) because they fail to show "a symmetrical design allows for a bi-directional rotor." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

One skilled in the art would understand that in order to have a bi-directional rotor, standoff vanes 302 would need to allow for similar airflow in either rotational direction. Therefore, one skilled in the art would understand that standoff vanes 302 would have to be symmetrical in order to avoid disruption of airflow. It is submitted that the shape of aerodynamic standoff vane 302 is not essential to understand the invention since the shape, height, length can vary for a particular application. Simply put, one skilled in the art would recognize that standoff vane 302, to allow for bi-directional rotation, would basically have the leading edge duplicated on the trailing edge (i.e., flipped over).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 37 CFR § 1.83(a) objection for the drawings is respectfully requested.

Figures 2 and 12 include proposed amendments. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the drawings overcome the Examiner's objection. Approval is respectfully requested.